UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2616th MEETING: 7 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2616)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa:	
Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2616th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 7 October 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS (United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2616)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

   Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Cameroon, Cuba, Ethiopia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Taleb Ibrahimi (Algeria), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Malmierca Peoli (Cuba), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Foum (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Sikaulu (Zambia) and Mr. Mangwende (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Ghana, Morocco and Tunisia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco) and Mr. Bouziri (Tunisia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 4 October 1985 from the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar, which reads as follows:

> "We have the honour to request that during the Security Council's discussion of the item entitled 'Complaint by Angola against South Africa', the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Mfanafuthi J. Makatini, Head of International Department and Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa to the United Nations."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation to Mr. Makatini under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/17531, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago.

5. The first speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. FOUM (United Republic of Tanzania): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. May I take this opportunity also to express our highest appreciation to Sir Geoffrey Howe, of the United Kingdom, for the efficient manner in which he conducted the commemorative meeting of the Council and to Sir John Thomson for the way he conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of September.

7. Like most States Members of the Organization, Tanzania learned with great dismay of the blatant attack by South African forces against the People's Republic of Angola in the province of Cuando-Cubango. It is to be recorded that the Council is now meeting for the third time in less than four months to deliberate on South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola.

8. The Council has accordingly adopted a number of resolutions condemning South Africa, the latest being resolution 567 (1985), of June 1985, and resolution 571 (1985), adopted only two weeks ago. What is most obvious is that all those resolutions, expressing the will of the international community as represented in this body, have remained unheeded. Those were resolutions aimed at staying the aggressive hand of *apartheid* South Africa. This latest act of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola is thus another violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms and principles of international law. As such, it poses a threat to international peace and security.

9. For almost 10 years now we have all witnessed what has become institutionalized aggression against Angola by the fascist forces of South Africa. Thus, what is before the Council, or what the Council should face, is not merely the present act of aggression in itself. Certainly, the act of aggression is in itself an issue that must be universally condemned. In our view, however, what needs to be fully examined is the larger issue of what South African aggression against Angola represents, why South Africa is afforded aid and comfort by some members of the Council, and the dangers attendant upon the motives for which such aid and comfort are given to the abhorred and condemned régime of *apartheid*.

10. South Africa has left no doubt as regards its racial arrogance and the extent to which it would go to sustain the system of *apartheid*. It is within the same context that the Pretoria régime has continued its colonial occupation of Namibia and used that international Territory as a springboard for aggression.

11. The Council will recall that South Africa has consistently used the so-called excuse of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) or the mirage of Communism to perpetrate aggression against Angola, as it has done against other neighbouring States. Subterfuge and double-talk and, above all, brute force have been the mainstays of the régime in its efforts to sustain its abhorred system and the colonial occupation of Namibia.

12. What is most glaring now is that that very same South Africa, the régime that has used brute force against the black people of South Africa and visited death and destruction on neighbouring independent States, is said to be the guardian of the highest Western values and the vanguard against Communism. It is imperative that those who have fed, sustained and unleashed this monstrous system against the black people of the area ask themselves some serious questions. Do they not value the lives, the humanity, the dignity and the freedom of the black people? Or do they value more highly their own ideological pursuits, which have very little relevance to the people whose humanity, freedom and dignity are being denied by their surrogate?

13. Angola has suffered aggression now, just as it has suffered aggression before and may suffer it again if these larger issues are not fully addressed. Angola has suffered aggression because South Africa is determined, in a manner apparently much admired by those that support it, to undermine Angola's freedom and sovereignty. Angola has suffered aggression at the hands of *apartheid* South Africa because, ever since the people of Angola won their freedom, imperialism has pursued every means available in an effort to change Angola's institutions and the very fabric of the society the Angolan people are trying to forge for themselves.

14. With the aid and comfort afforded it by supporters, *apartheid* South Africa today represents all that is dangerous and that threatens peace and security in the region. *Apartheid* South Africa has arrogated to itself the role of regional gendarme and is acting as the surrogate of imperialism.

15. The representative of Angola has eloquently presented to the Council the facts of the latest attack on Angola [*2612th meeting*]. It has thus been shown that even the spurious excuse of pursuing the SWAPO militants is no longer being advanced. That latest act of aggression was an act directly aimed at assisting the bandits of UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*), who are South Africa protégés, organized, financed, armed and launched by the *apartheid* régime to undermine the freedom and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola.

16. The dangers inherent in such policies and practices must be clear to all. In seeking to cross borders with a view to supporting bandits and subverting the institutions of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola, South Africa has acted in much the same way as those that, acting on the dubious concept of so-called hot pursuit, have violated the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States in Central America, in the Middle East and, most recently, in North Africa, where Tunisia suffered a cowardly bombardment.

17. We consider the latest act of aggression against Angola to be part of an institutionalized concept of aggression, part of a pattern for the subversion of the region by imperialism. It is thus a dangerous escalation of the

already serious state of tension in the region caused by the existence of *apartheid*.

18. In condemning South African aggression we also need to point out the responsibility shared by those institutions that have consistently and wrongfully persisted in their association with the *apartheid* régime. It must be reiterated that *apartheid* South Africa has been able to continue with institutionalized racism and its acts of aggression because of the aid and comfort it draws from the policy of so-called constructive engagement of the United States. Suffice it to say that of late that policy has been the main pillar of the tottering system of *apartheid*. It is to a very large extent the main external source of encouragement for the perpetrators of *apartheid*.

19. The United Nations has the duty, through the Security Council, at this stage, to ensure the observance of norms necessary for peace and security. The People's Republic of Angola has been before the Council on a number of occasions demanding action to stay the hand of the aggressor. The general membership of the Organization has on a number of occasions demanded action to eradicate the system of *apartheid*, which is the cause of the aggression. *Apartheid* is itself aggression. It is a permanent assault on the freedom, the dignity and the very humanity of the blacks of South Africa and of the region as a whole. The Council is the highest international institution, and can, given the co-operation of all its members, ensure observance of the decisions of the Organization for peace and security and for freedom, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

20. We therefore join those who have done so before us in demanding that South Africa be made to pay for the loss of life and damage to property sustained by Angola. More important, however, we consider it high time for the Council to take action to ensure that *apartheid* South Africa no longer commits aggression. To that end, it is our hope that the Council will take appropriate action under Chapter VII of the Charter and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the *apartheid* régime. To do otherwise, to fail to act firmly and with conviction, can only send the wrong signals to a régime universally abhorred and internationally condemned. That would be tragic. For that reason the Council will take action, we hope, as already demanded by the People's Republic of Angola and as dictated by the real threat to peace and security caused by the policies and practices of the *apartheid* régime.

21. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Mozambique. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. DOS SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, I welcome you to the United Nations. My delegation is pleased to see you presiding over the affairs of the Council during the month of October. Your mastery of many languages—American, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Brazilian, Russian and others—will, I am convinced, help you understand the cries and plight of our women and children, the old and the infirm, who are being crushed by the brutal war machine of South Africa and Israel in Africa and the Middle East: in Angola and Mozambique, in Botswana and Zimbabwe, in Lesotho and Namibia, in Lebanon and Tunisia.

23. I also wish to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, who, with Shakespearian language and wisdom, handled the Council's affairs last month.

24. It would be remiss of me not to express my delegation's gratitude to you and to the other members of the Council for the opportunity given to me to address it.

25. Africa is once again the victim of barbarous aggression perpetrated by two equally barbarous, blood-thirsty régimes: the *apartheid* régime and Israeli régime. The two régimes shudder at any prospect of peace, for peace would mean their demise. They fear peace as one fears cyanide, for it kills in seconds. Aggression is as essential to their existence as oxygen is to human beings.

26. The cyanide time-bomb has been ticking during the past several months in the Middle East, and Israel was thrown into utter confusion, for it was not able to deal with it effectively. Finally it found a way by throwing it at innocent people in Tunisia. The target was carefully chosen in order to arouse the utmost disgust and thus derail the peace process. Had the attack been carried out against Lebanon, it would probably not have aroused so much horror, for the world seems to have accepted such acts there as a matter of fact.

27. The two régimes carried out their aggression almost at the same time against the same continent, killing almost the same number of people. Both régimes arrogate to themselves the right to kill Palestinians and Africans whenever their warmongering fancy takes them.

28. Just a few days ago, the international community learned with a profound sense of shock of the barbaric and cold-blooded attack against Palestinians and Tunisians in Tunisia carried out by the régime of Israel. The attack on Tunisia constituted a gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Tunisia and a threat to international peace and security. The international community, rightly, has strongly condemned that dastardly act. The People's Republic of Mozambique vehemently condemns that barbaric act and expresses its solidarity with the people and Government of Tunisia.

29. The People's Republic of Mozambique reaffirms its support for and solidarity with the Palestine Liberation Organization and its legitimate struggle.

30. The people of Angola has once again been the victim of armed aggression perpetrated by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. Once again the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola have been violated. The Charter of the United Nations, the resolutions and decisions of the Security Council, the organ primarily responsible for the mainte-

nance of international peace and security, have been completely ignored.

31. South African acts of aggression against the sisterly country of Angola date back to 1975, before the independence of the country, and those against Mozambique date back to the first year of our armed struggle for national liberation. Since then, those acts of aggression have continued and have further escalated in intensity. That fact alone proves that South African aggression against Angola is not and never was aimed at anything but the undermining of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola. It is against the political and economic independence of Angola that the *apartheid* régime is acting, against the legitimate right of the people of the country freely to decide its own fate.

32. The South African aggression against Angola is also part of the whole process of destabilization carried out by South Africa against the countries of southern Africa, particularly the front-line States.

33. South Africa has perpetrated aggression against Angola, Mozambique, Lesotho, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Seychelles. Using armed bandits which it itself recruited, trained, armed and infiltrated, the *apartheid* régime is waging an undeclared war against our countries.

34. Armed banditry is an operational weapon in the hands of the Pretoria régime to massacre defenceless populations, to destroy the social and economic infrastructures of the countries of the region and to hinder the economic development of these countries. The South African Development Co-ordination Conference—the expression of the countries of the region in regard to economic development and co-operation—has fallen victim to systematic sabotage.

35. The latest in the long chain of aggressive acts against Angola by South Africa came at a moment when the armed forces of Angola have been inflicting heavy blows on UNITA on the military front. Indeed, military operations carried out by the Angolan armed forces against the bandits of UNITA have led to the virtual destruction of the sanctuaries of the latter. In this context, the recent South African acts of aggression should be seen as aimed first and foremost at rescuing UNITA from total annihilation and at supplying these bandits with more military equipment for them to carry out their massacres against civilian populations and to destroy the economic and social infrastructures of Angola. As is well known, these armed gangs could not survive without the backing of the Pretoria régime for which they work.

36. The aggression against Angola was most probably also carried out in order to distract world public opinion from the crimes *apartheid* is committing against innocent and defenceless people in South Africa itself.

37. It is therefore incumbent upon the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole to act decisively to bring to an end these systematic acts of war against the countries of southern Africa.

38. What is involved is not only the acts of aggression against Angola or the destabilization of southern Africa, but the threat to international peace and security posed by the neo-Nazi régime of Pretoria.

39. What the people of Angola are expecting from the Council is not just one more resolution. International peace and security cannot be safeguarded by a resolution or by resolutions. It demands concerted and decisive action to translate into practical steps what the resolutions contain.

40. The people of Angola, like our people, cherish peace and reject everything that is against this noble objective. For centuries the people of Angola had been subjected to brutality and colonial violence. To their quest for justice, freedom and dignity, the colonial fascist had always responded with systematic massacres. When the MPLA (*People's Liberation Movement of Angola*) was created, it gave preference, first and foremost, to dialogue and negotiations as the means to regain the dignity, freedom and independence of the people of Angola. The armed struggle that was to be launched later on did not represent a break with or the abandoning of this desire for dialogue. It came as the only reasonable and possible alternative, in order to preserve the people's lives and their freedom and their dignity in the face of the colonial-fascist intransigence.

41. After their hard-won independence, the people of Angola sought nothing but to consolidate their victory and devote all their efforts to national reconstruction.

42. It is in this context that, despite South African aggression, the People's Republic of Angola and the People's Republic of Mozambique have not abdicated their principles of peaceful coexistence and their search for peaceful solutions to the problems affecting the region.

43. As for South Africa, its criminal record is well known to the international community and, naturally, to the Security Council and the United Nations in general. *Apartheid* has been declared a crime against humankind.

44. In southern Africa, the cyanide grenade has been in place since 1969, when the Manifesto on Southern Africa[1] was adopted—a manifesto that proposed a peaceful solution to the *apartheid* system, thus sparing the region from cataclysms and bloodshed. The proposals may have been advanced far ahead of their time. Neither South Africa nor its friends would accept them. South Africa seemed mighty strong and was on the verge of becoming even stronger with its friends' brotherly counsel and multifaceted and generous help. A military solution was seen at that time as the best answer to preserve this last bastion of Western civilization, with its rich mineral resources, in that part of our continent. South Africa was armed to the teeth. We are now reaping the fruits of that policy.

45. In the last two years, important peace initiatives have been embarked upon in southern Africa. South Africa was seen as liking to take all its clothes off before the whole

world community of nations. So why not help it to do so, and to do so as quickly as possible? By 1983 South Africa had already taken off everything but its underwear. In 1984 even the underwear was finally taken off, revealing the ugly, monstrous body of *apartheid* for everyone to see; the demented mind of *apartheid* also became obvious.

46. We have always known and stated the racist South African's true intentions. Now they cannot hide them. They are now publicly acknowledging their breach of accords and understandings they have entered into. Acts of aggression against Angola and Mozambique are no longer justified in terms of hot pursuit but in terms of propping up their agents and puppets, the defeat of which they are not prepared to countenance or accept. They are now publicly asserting that their aggressive troops are likely to continue not only to carry out their aggression but to occupy any neighbouring States until what they call foreign troops are removed.

47. Now nothing can be hidden even from those who at one time or another chose to be blind to the true nature of *apartheid*. It has finally started the precipitous descent of the steep slopes of the Himalayan mountain with no possibility of returning to the top, for as it descends the mountain its speed increases at an exponential rate and it can stop only when it crashes in the valley below, plunging the area into a bloodbath. Once set in motion, the body cannot stop itself at mid-slope, nor can it be stopped by anyone else. No wonder, then, that racist South Africa seems to be oblivious of its own interest. In its descent it will undoubtedly uproot both young sprouts and old trees. As the *apartheid* régime becomes more and more desperate in its attempt to preserve itself, the use of chemical, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction will become an increasing possibility. It may even take to its death some of the stones that are now desperately trying to cushion its fall. But keep in mind also that the stones, once they reach the valley below, cannot go up the slope again; however, new sprouts will spring up on the entire slope to give life to new and vigorous plants of freedom and independence.

48. The imposition of the state of emergency is nothing but a desperate attempt by the régime to avoid the unavoidable. As expected, the state of emergency has not brought about the results the racist régime expected. It has, instead, strengthened the people's detestation of *apartheid*.

49. The struggle of the South African people is experiencing one success after another. South Africans of all colours and races come out barehanded to face the *apartheid* repressive machinery—the police and the army. The foundations of a new South African nation are taking shape. No force can deter the determination of the South African people to free themselves from oppression and brutalization.

50. Namibia's independence is as inevitable as the rising of the sun. Justice, freedom, majority rule and democracy will prevail in South Africa. The People's Republic of Angola is there to stay, whether South Africa likes it or not. This is not a dream. Nobody can stop the wind with bare hands. It is up to the South African régime to decide whether or not it wants to learn from history. Whatever its decision may be, one thing is certain: the wheel of history will inexorably continue to turn, and to roll towards a land of freedom, independence, justice, peace, a land where the word *apartheid* is anathema.

51. Mr. MOHAMMED (Trinidad and Tobago): The Council is considering yet another South African armed attack on the People's Republic of Angola. This latest attack, carried out on 28 September 1985, was a particularly vicious one, in that over 200 Angolans were either killed or wounded by the South Africans. The attack typifies the persistent, hostile, unprovoked acts of aggression and the sustained armed invasions committed by the racist régime of South Africa in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

52. Early in our debate [*2612th meeting*], the representative of the South African minority régime contended that the attack was undertaken against Angola in the defence of liberty, in the context of the East-West ideological confrontation and in order to permit the self-determination and independence of Angola. Coming from a country which practices the abhorrent policy of *apartheid*, with its built-in system of denial of self-determination to the majority of the population, such a contention is totally baseless. The minority Pretoria régime cannot presume to articulate the will and interests of 31 million oppressed and politically disenfranchised South Africans and Namibians living under *apartheid*. In any event, there is no legal justification under the Charter for the violation by South Africa of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

53. South Africa's attack against Angola was undertaken as a means of strengthening its hold on Namibia. Namibia is illegally occupied by South Africa, and South Africa's aggression is compounded by its actions taken to maintain its illegal occupation of the Territory by launching armed attacks on Angola from Namibia and by occupying parts of Angola's territory.

54. South Africa's premeditated and unprovoked attack against Angola and its continuing occupation of parts of the territory of that State constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and ought to be strongly condemned by the Council. My delegation reiterates its call on South Africa to cease its persistent acts of aggression against Angola, to remove forthwith its military forces from Angolan territory and to respect the territorial integrity and independence of Angola.

55. The deteriorating situation in southern Africa, with its wider implications for international peace and security, must be addressed effectively by the Council. The Council should reaffirm the right of the People's Republic of Angola, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter, to take all measures necessary to defend and safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.

56. The Council should also impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Char-

ter. That would send a clear signal to the Pretoria régime that its policies of aggression against Angola, and indeed against other States in southern Africa, would no longer be tolerated.

57. In conclusion, the Trinidad and Tobago delegation expresses the hope that the Council will take a unanimous decision against South Africa as a way of demonstrating to the *apartheid* régime the Council's displeasure with that régime's consistent violations of the Charter and of the resolutions of the Council, as exemplified by this latest attack on Angola.

58. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has been compelled to meet again to consider an act of aggression carried out by the South African armed forces against the People's Republic of Angola. Just a week after the adoption of resolution 571 (1985), in which the Council, *inter alia*, strongly condemned "the racist régime of South Africa for its premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola", the South African air force carried out raids into Angolan territory in support of racist soldiers who had come to the aid of the UNITA puppets who were experiencing difficulties as a result of the advance of Angolan Government troops. The facts, as reported by the representative of Angola and by the press, are serious: about 60 soldiers of the people's liberation armed forces were killed and six helicopters were shot down.

59. South Africa's latest act of aggression against Angola is one part of the well-known hostile policy of the racist régime of Pretoria towards the independent African States of the region. To entrench its domination in southern Africa, South Africa has committed many acts of sabotage and political and economic destabilization. It is supplying financial and military assistance to so-called liberation movements which are fully in its pay and to dissident groups to enable them to attempt to overthrow the legitimate Governments, whether of Angola, Mozambique, Botswana or Lesotho. All this is crowned by the systematic use of direct military aggression against these countries. All these measures of intimidation unquestionably constitute aggression within the meaning of article 3 of the Definition of Aggression annexed to General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), and pose a real threat to peace and security in the region, and hence in the world.

60. Whatever South Africa's explanations in its attempt to justify its latest act of aggression, there is no doubt that it has yet again carried out a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. The racist régime's arrogance and hypocrisy pass beyond tolerable limits when we hear its representative insult the wisdom of the Council and dictate to us the conditions for Angolan national reconciliation and for the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of that country.

61. It is South Africa, and South Africa alone, which for the past 10 years has been attempting not only to destabilize the legitimate Government of Angola but also to throttle the Angolan economy by granting assistance of various kinds to the UNITA puppets and by establishing a policy of State terrorism. If there is a State that should respect the principle of the non-use of force or threat of the use of force against an independent State and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, it is certainly South Africa.

62. In fact, assured of an unsavory impunity and imbued with its arrogance, South Africa is trying to impose on the States of the region its wrong view of the world and international events to force them to depend on its military and economic power. Respect for international law and strict implementation of the Charter are basic obligations for all States, and in many resolutions we have recognized Angola's right to take, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, in particular Article 51, all necessary steps to defend and safeguard its sovereignty and its independence. We have also condemned South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and the use of it as a base for the launching of armed attacks against Angola.

63. We have seen that the deeds ascribed to the *apartheid* régime have not been denied at all, and no attempt at rational justification has been made, save to give us arguments that have been heard so many times, but never taken seriously, about what Pretoria thinks about democracy and about the rearguard action conducted against the irreversible course of history.

64. It is true that because they are shut up in an intellectual and political ghetto they no longer manage to see the facts, except through the distorting mirror of an obsolete fundamentalism.

65. By what right can South Africa claim to speak for the aspirations of the Angolan people? What provision of international law allows it grossly to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign, independent State and to advocate the overthrow of a legitimate Government that has been internationally recognized? What right does South Africa have to take upon itself the way in which Angola intends to defend itself, to safeguard its sovereignty and its territorial integrity and to conduct its policy according to a system it has freely chosen?

66. Again we seem to be hearing the voice of the master ordering his slave to do what he wants, and only what the master wants him to do. We should know that South Africa is a power foreign to Angola, and not yet its tutelar power. We most strongly reject South African hegemonism, this new aspect of imperialism, which would undermine peace and stability for its sole advantage. A little modesty, a little restraint, a little logic would be appropriate—unless these concepts are unknown in the land of *apartheid*, which would not surprise us.

67. Naturally we feel solidarity with the people of Angola, to which we reaffirm our fraternal sympathy. We unreservedly condemn the latest act of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against Angola. We believe it is time for the Council to take specific measures to have its resolutions complied with, particularly at this fortieth

anniversary of the Organization. In article 6 and Chapter VII, the Charter gives us the necessary means to put an end to the scorn of the racist régime of Pretoria for the United Nations and the international community. We should require South Africa to give just compensation to the People's Republic of Angola for the loss of life and the material damage that has resulted from its acts of aggression.

68. It is in this spirit that we, along with the delegations of Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago, have submitted the draft resolution now before the Council in document S/17531.

69. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

70. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): I should like to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am confident that, with your rich diplomatic background, you will preside over the Council with great skill and a sense of purpose.

71. May I also congratulate the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, on the able manner in which he presided over the Council last month.

72. It is rather remarkable that until last Friday, when it adopted resolution 573 (1985), the Security Council was alternately considering two serious cases of aggression committed almost at the same time against two African countries, Angola and Tunisia. The acts of aggression against Angola and Tunisia have been committed by two régimes, those of South Africa and Israel respectively, known to be close friends and collaborators in the military field.

73. Both régimes are famous for their intransigence, for their arrogance and utter contempt for the United Nations, including the Security Council. Indeed, both régimes have no regard for the norms of international law, which they break at will, relying heavily on their awesome military might. Through the use of force, the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes delude themselves into believing that they can evade the fundamental issues of *apartheid* and minority rule in South Africa and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine.

74. The challenge before the Security Council is simply this: does it continue to deal with the effects of the conflicts in southern Africa and the Middle East, or is it not time that it became more realistic and found solutions to the problems of *apartheid* and minority rule in South Africa and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in the Middle East, which are the root causes of the conflicts and which therefore will have to be resolved for justice and conditions of durable peace and security to prevail in both regions?

75. It is only a few days since the Council met to discuss the invasion of Angola by the racist régime of South Africa. During that meeting, Zambia expressed its indignation and disgust at that act of aggression against Angola, which led to the loss of life and property. We called on the Council to exercise its functions and powers having regard to its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. We made it clear then, as we have in the past, that South Africa is indeed a real threat to international peace and security.

76. Today, the Council is meeting to consider yet another unprovoked act of aggression by the unrepentant Pretoria régime. Once again we have South Africa, defiant as ever, invading a loyal and committed State Member of the United Nations. More innocent lives have been lost, more property has been destroyed, and tension in the area has been heightened.

77. This new act of aggression, much in the pattern of its predecessor, has been committed in spite of the demand by the Council that South Africa cease all acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and respect Angola's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Resolution 571 (1985), unanimously adopted by the Council two weeks ago, has been ignored by South Africa. And this is not the first time that the racist régime in Pretoria has totally and with impunity ignored the well-intentioned decisions of the Council.

78. The racist South African régime has more than amply demonstrated that it is determined to continue to kill innocent men, women and children, not only in South Africa but also in neighbouring countries, and to continue to pursue its policy of violence and destabilization in the region, in defence of its inhuman and satanic system of *apartheid*. Yet all of us in the international community, indeed all the members of the Security Council, with as much regularity, state our opposition to *apartheid*. Our words against *apartheid*, which have filled volumes, have not been enough; they have been aimed at an impervious régime and have had no impact on it at all.

79. The South African régime is clearly not in a position to listen to the voice of reason. It has buried its head in the sand and deliberately refuses to see the serious repercussions of its policy of *apartheid*, which propels it to commit violent actions both inside South Africa and in neighbouring countries. That same policy of *apartheid* is responsible for South Africa's continued stranglehold over Namibia. South Africa clings to Namibia illegally in order to continue using it as a buffer for *apartheid* and a springboard for committing acts of aggression against independent African States which oppose *apartheid*.

80. The time has come for the Security Council to ponder seriously about how to deal with the problem posed by the policies and practices of *apartheid* of the South African régime. There must be a credible alternative to the mere passage of resolutions of admonition or condemnation which are honoured only in the breach by the Pretoria régime. The Council should tell South Africa in no uncertain terms that enough is enough, and adopt

action-oriented resolutions aimed at the eradication of *apartheid* and the elimination of its manifestations, such as the relentless acts of aggression against independent African countries and the continued illegal occupation of Namibia.

81. South Africa must no longer be allowed to continue to feel that, in spite of pronouncements critical of *apartheid*, in reality it continues to enjoy tacit political support from some major Western Powers. And decisive action against South Africa would also be the best repudiation by those same major Western Powers of the all-too-frequent assertions by the Pretoria régime that it is the annointed custodian of Western interests in southern Africa. Well, it would indeed be unwise, if not foolish and short-sighted, for a régime which is sure to crumble to be entrusted with such a responsibility. The Pretoria régime simply has no future; it will not be there much longer to protect the interests of its friends and allies. The opponents of *apartheid*, the oppressed masses of South Africa, possess the key to long-term, fruitful and co-operative relations between South Africa and the rest of the world.

82. While we appreciate the imposition of limited sanctions against South Africa by some countries, we feel that those sanctions have not gone far enough. What is needed is the imposition of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Only in this way will the international community express its real displeasure at the atrocities being committed by South Africa and expect meaningful change away from *apartheid* in South Africa. More than ever before, there is need now for comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter as an available peaceful means to bring about change. Let no country pretend otherwise, for the alternative is a bloodbath in South Africa of unimaginable proportions.

83. We the people of southern Africa want peace, but there can be no peace, there can be no stability and there can be no security in our region until the scourge of *apartheid* is completely eliminated.

84. Mr. BASSOLE (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): The racist minority régime of South Africa has once again drawn itself to the attention of international public opinion through its policy of systematic and premeditated aggression against the independent countries of southern Africa.

85. Beset from within by movements in opposition to *apartheid*, incapable of dealing in a responsible manner with the legitimate demands of the immense black majority for freedom, justice and equality, the racist authorities of Pretoria believe that they are gaining time and prolonging their existence by brandishing the spectre of an imaginary external threat. This kind of conduct, which is peculiar to moribund and practically bankrupt régimes, is well known; it is no surprise to us, any more than it surprises all those who have been closely following developments in South Africa.

86. The latest attacks against Angola took place eight days after the adoption by the Council of resolution 571 (1985). While the relevant provisions of that resolution have not even begun to be implemented for lack of time, we are here meeting again to deal with a new complaint. The victim is the same—the People's Republic of Angola; the aggressor is the same—racist South Africa; and the reason put forewo:d for the aggression is also the same: the need to pursue SWAPO troops into Angolan territory.

87. The most varied appeals have been made to racist South Africa calling upon it to abandon *apartheid* and to put an end to the oppression and repression of the black majority and to seek a peaceful, just and lasting solution to the problems of southern Africa, in accordance with the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, all to no avail. There has been an increase in the acts of aggression against independent African States.

88. For Burkina Faso the underlying meaning of such violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States is to be found in the broader context of South Africa's constant defiance of the world, in its attempt to justify its repression of the black African majority, the continuation of its colonial presence, the exploitation of Namibia's wealth and the systematic policy of destabilization of the countries of the region.

89. What has been happening in South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique and now Angola—in other words, the terror constantly being inflicted upon southern Africa by the racist Pretoria régime—is based on one and the same logic, that of an *apartheid* régime attacked on all sides and now dug into its last remaining positions, a régime that believes that it can ensure its survival only by blind violence and systematic lying.

90. In the light of these breaches of the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, the international community, and first and foremost the Security Council, must react firmly and resolutely against the Pretoria racists by adopting against them the necessary comprehensive mandatory sanctions as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. Burkina Faso is convinced that it is high time this was done. Countries that continue to refuse to do this are playing into the hands of South Africa, which takes advantage of their hesitancy and irresolution in order to violate with impunity the most elementary rules of international law and the provisions of the Charter.

91. Such contemptuous behaviour by the racist Pretoria Government is curiously reminiscent of the behaviour of the Nazi authorities on the eve of the Second World War. By yielding to Hitler's whims, the allied Powers of the day eventually convinced him that he could press ahead with his expansionist and annexationist aims in Europe and elsewhere in the world. By the time it was realized that it was necessary to mobilize and confront the forces of Hitlerism it was already too late, and widespread war had become inevitable.

92. If they are to be effective, the sanctions we are calling for today must be accompanied by appropriate assistance to Angola and the other front-line States to help them defend themselves against South Africa's barbarous acts of aggression and destabilization. Such assistance, which is requested in paragraph 5 of resolution 571 (1985), must be both immediate and on a large scale because the scope and rhythm of the South African attacks show the extent to which the *apartheid* régime is prepared to go in spreading death and destruction in the region.

93. The new act of aggression against Angola testifies to the survival of the vestiges of the forces of *apartheid*, racial discrimination and colonial tyranny, and to their stubborn resistance to the forces of change.

94. As the international community commemorates the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, we should reflect on the lessons it drew therefrom in order not to repeat the same mistakes. With regard to South Africa, the mistake would be to continue to believe in any way in the good faith of the Pretoria leaders and to remain silent in the face of their deeds.

95. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Ethiopia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

96. Mr. DINKA (Ethiopia): I should like at the outset to express the gratitude of my delegation to you, Mr. President, and to the other members of the Council for affording us the opportunity to participate in this important debate. I should also like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. We have no doubt that your wide experience and proven abilities will contribute to meaningful consideration of this item.

97. I also express my appreciation to Sir John Thomson, representative of the United Kingdom, for the able manner in which he guided the work of the Council last month.

98. Once again the Council has been convened to consider South African aggression against the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola. In spite of the anger expressed by the international community and the Council's condemnation barely two weeks ago of the cowardly acts perpetrated by the racist régime of Pretoria against Angola, the same racist régime has again had the audacity to mount yet another attack against the territory of the sister Republic of Angola. As in the past, the racist régime has advanced frivolous excuses to justify the unjustifiable. We are being told that such raids are conducted with the aim of forestalling any possibility of an attack by SWAPO, although it is well known to one and all that it is the occupation forces of South Africa which have used Namibian territory to wage war on the People's Republic of Angola, with the express purpose of saving from total defeat the renegade UNITA bandits.

99. The truth is that, having failed to reverse the tide of history within the confines of South Africa, the terrorist régime is now bent on extending the tentacles of its well-known system of State terrorism deep into the territorial heartlands of the neighbouring States. Only a few months ago, Botswana was a victim of this nefarious scheme.

100. For how long can the African countries neighbouring South Africa live under such a state of terror and intimidation? For how long are those countries to be victims of arrogant sabre-rattling by the *apartheid* régime?

101. With the mounting opposition to *apartheid*, especially in those Western countries whose Governments' collaboration with the racist régime is well known, we had hoped that those Governments would heed the unequivocal voices of their own populations and prevail upon the *apartheid* régime, which they have for long mistakenly perceived as an ally and the bastion of Western civilization. We had entertained the hope that the time had come for those countries to take concrete steps against the illegal conduct of that régime with a view to compelling Pretoria to desist from such banditry. It seems our hopes were vain.

102. It is a sad commentary on the efficacy of the Security Council that the South African régime has found it expedient to violate the territorial integrity of a Member State at a moment when all peace-loving nations are enthusiastically celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

103. If these unwarranted acts of banditry are allowed to continue unchecked, the racist régime is bound to intensify its aggression against the front-line States. It is abundantly clear that the front-line States cannot face alone the challenges posed by the repeated aggression and the destabilization schemes of Pretoria. All nations committed to the maintenance of peace and security and loyal to the fundamental principles of the Charter and the basic tenets of international law must join hands in confronting South Africa and its belligerent conduct in a credible manner.

104. In this connection, we appeal once again to the Security Council to take concrete enforcement measures against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. While expressing our solidarity with the Government and people of the People's Republic of Angola at this trying moment, we urge the Council to shoulder its responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security.

105. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Barely two weeks have elapsed since the Security Council last considered the question of the acts of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against Angola. The Council then adopted a resolution in which it demanded that South Africa withdraw forthwith and unconditionally all its military forces from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, cease all acts of aggression against that State and scrupulously respect its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

106. Yet here we are again today dealing with the gross acts of armed aggression perpetrated by the South African

army and air force. As the Council knows, at least eight military aircraft took part in the raid, which was supported by South African units fighting on the side of the UNITA gangs. A large number of casualties were caused and material damage was sustained.

107. These latest acts of aggression by Pretoria against Angola clearly show that because of the racist régime, a situation has emerged in southern Africa which is a threat to the cause of peace.

108. The latest unprovoked act of aggression must be added to the long list of crimes by the *apartheid* régime against neighbouring States. We still clearly recall the carnage that South African commandos caused in June in Botswana, where they killed and wounded dozens of people. At the end of June, South African military units crossed the border of Angola and invaded the territory of that country. Again, dozens of people fell victim to that gangsterish raid. Three months later, there was another act of aggression against Angola, and again innocent people died and material damage was sustained. This year alone, the Council has three times taken up the question of the tense situation in South Africa, and it has five times dealt with situations connected to aggression by the Pretoria régime against independent States.

109. We have stated many times in the Council that the South African racists are acting in such a defiant and brazen manner merely because they are supported by broad-based and constant political, diplomatic, economic and military assistance given by the United States and a number of other Western countries and Israel.

110. "Your goals are our goals. I wish you success and God bless you." These are not my words—I have quoted them from the message from the United States President to the mob of ring leaders of the terrorist gangs that met in June this year near the Angolan border. The question arises as to how the United States Administration can try to convince international public opinion about its concern for a "peaceful solution" to the problems of southern Africa and other regions while it is fostering terror against legitimate Governments. The terrorist grouping UNITA took part in that gathering, as did the anti-Mozambique gang the MNR (*National Resistance Movement*). This was clearly mentioned in the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe [*2614th meeting*].

111. I should like to draw the Council's attention to the growing collaboration between the régimes in South Africa and Israel, which has virtually led to an alliance between them, posing a threat to international peace and security. This has been borne out, for example, by the act of aggression by Israel against Tunisia, consideration of which has just been concluded in the Council.

112. Of particular danger is the growing scale of the military and nuclear collaboration between these two régimes. South Africa is a major purchaser of weapons from Israel; it accounts for 35 per cent of Israeli arms exports in recent years. Israel has sold South Africa gunboats and Gabriel missiles.

113. According to the United Nations Special Committee against *Apartheid*, Israel is encouraging South African Jews to visit Israel and to do one month's military service there on an annual basis. According to the statement by the representative of the so-called Council of Volunteers in support of Israel, over a period of two years more than 3,500 South Africans aged from 20 to 60 have visited Israel for that very purpose.

114. I could give other examples of the collaboration between South Africa and Israel.

115. We are compelled to agree with the finding of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* to the effect that the violent, oppressive and aggressive actions of the Pretoria régime

> "underline that any form of assistance to the military, police, intelligence or other forces in South Africa is nothing less than complicity in the crimes of the *apartheid* régime."[2]

116. There is very good reason why Pretoria's extremism has grown precisely now, when the Republic of South Africa is going through an acute crisis caused by actions by the oppressed black majority which are unprecedented in scale and force. The racist régime has lost control of the situation in the country. In these conditions, the ruling clique is hoping to reinforce its positions through military adventures. Attempts are being made to perpetuate their domination in Namibia, and banditlike aggressive acts against independent countries by Pretoria are becoming more frequent and are being intensified.

117. Again, worthy of note is the parallel between South Africa's actions and those of Israel. Tel Aviv, which is also confronting complicated problems caused by its own policy of aggression and occupation in lands which do not belong to it, is trying to resolve those problems by actions beyond its own borders. The most recent example of this took place thousands of kilometres away from Israel.

118. Again, this points to the serious threat posed by the policies of South Africa and Israel to peace and security not only in southern Africa and the Middle East but in the whole world.

119. To put an end to the crimes of *apartheid* and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States, we need decisive action, including that provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. This was mentioned in the special communiqué adopted on 1 October 1985 by the Ministers and heads of delegation of the non-aligned countries, at the fortieth session of the General Assembly [*S/17518, annex*]. The Ukrainian SSR strongly supports their demand. The Security Council should do its duty and defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

120. The Ukrainian SSR expresses full solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Angolan people, which has taken up arms to defend its freedom and independence. We strongly condemn South Africa's aggression against Angola and demand that it be halted immediately and unconditionally, that there be an unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and that acts of aggression against that country be prevented in future.

121. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

122. Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is my pleasure to open my statement by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. We are convinced that you will preside over the Council's deliberations with the utmost skill and objectivity.

123. I also wish to thank your predecessor, Sir John Thomson, representative of the United Kingdom, for his skilful and wise leadership of the Council during the month of September.

124. For the third time this year, the Council is meeting to consider yet another act of aggression perpetrated by the racist régime in South Africa against Angola. If this fact can be said to point to anything, it points to the disregard and contempt in which this racist régime holds the meetings and resolutions of the Council.

125. The racist régimes in South Africa and Israel have become the Council's main preoccupation. No sooner has the Council adjourned than it is once more convened to discuss a new act of aggression. One may indeed think it a remarkable coincidence that the two régimes should perpetrate two acts of aggression against two African countries at the same time. That is a further indication of the role entrusted to those racist régimes, which is aimed at undermining the will of peoples, at eliminating national liberation movements and forcing the States of the third world to submit to the colonialist will imposed on them from outside.

126. The justifications put forward by the Government of South Africa for perpetrating its acts of aggression, such as invoking the right to self-defence for intervening in the internal affairs of Angola, are rejected, because they run counter to the principles of the Charter and the rules of international law. International law and jurisprudence provide that two fundamental conditions must be present to exercise that right. The first is urgent need, and the second is that the use of force be a proportionate response to the danger posed. Those conditions were not present at all in the case of the acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against a small peace-loving State such as Angola, which presents no danger whatsoever to a strong State with such huge military arsenals as South Africa possesses.

127. The concept of international law on the conditions for the use of the right to self-defence and the non-applicability of such conditions to the act of aggression perpetrated by the Pretoria régime against Angola in September were summed up by a United States State Department spokesman, who is reported in *The New York Times* of 18 September as follows:

> "The position of the United States Government is that any use of force by a State has to be justified under the doctrine of self-defence. There is no inherent right to engage in military activity across one's borders on the basis that it is a pre-emptive strike.
>
> "From an international-law standpoint, the important issue is whether the use of force in question is justified from the standpoint of self-defence, in that it must be reasonable and a proportionate response to the danger posed. South Africa's raid did not appear to be justified by a clear and imminent danger to Namibian territory, and therefore was not reasonable and a proportionate response."*

128. That quotation makes it clear that the act of aggression by the South African Government against Angola was a flagrant act of aggression, according to the General Assembly's Definition of Aggression adopted by the General Assembly and annexed to resolution 3314 (XXIX), article 3 of which defines aggression as "The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State".*

129. As they have been described, the acts of aggression perpetrated by Pretoria are such as to require the application of sanctions against South Africa under Article 39 of the Charter. Any reluctance, any hampering of the implementation of such sanctions will only encourage the régime to renew its acts of aggression. We must not forget that this is the third time the régime has perpetrated an act of aggression against Angola in the past few months, not to mention previous acts committed against Angola and other front-line States.

130. The racist practises of the régime against the black majority in South Africa, its occupation of the Territory of Namibia and its acts of aggression against the African front-line States will not end unless the régime feels the seriousness of the international attitude to such acts. Such seriousness will be achieved when States that still deal with the régime in one way or another put an end to that practice and apply economic sanctions by imposing a comprehensive embargo on South Africa. I refer particularly to those States that continue to provide the régime with vital supplies, States that bear a special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. Those States bear the international responsibility to look at the régime in that light, so that international peace and security prevail over narrow economic interests.

131. Justice, equality and human rights form an indivisible whole. Africans are entitled to them just as much as other human beings in any other part of the world. If

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

international efforts were concerted to ensure the application of international law and the principles of the Charter, the Council would have no need to meet so often to discuss these issues.

132. The United Arab Emirates once again stresses its strong condemnation of South Africa's act of aggression. We declare our solidarity with Angola, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and with the other front-line States. We reaffirm our support for the national liberation movements in Namibia and South Africa, which are fighting for their national rights and their right to self-determination.

133. We once again call upon the Council not to cause the small States of the world to lose their faith in it. At the time of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and in the light of the recent commemorative meeting of the Council at the ministerial level, Angola's complaint is indeed a test: to see whether the Council can regain its effectiveness and credibility and shoulder the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security. We hope that the Council will rise to its responsibilities.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

[2] *Ibid., Fortieth Session*, Supplement No. 22, para. 374.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—January 1995—1,925